



TEXAS INSTRUMENTS INCORPORATED  
P O BOX 655474, M/S 3999  
DALLAS TX 75265

**COPY MAILED**

**SEP 22 2006**

**OFFICE OF PETITIONS**

In re Application of  
Muthia Venkateswaran  
Application No. 10/789,646  
Filed: March 1, 2004  
Attorney Docket No. TI-34105.1

:  
:  
: DECISION ON PETITION  
: UNDER 37 CFR 1.78(a)(3)  
:

This is a decision on the petition filed April 4, 2006, under 37 CFR 1.78(a)(3) to accept an unintentionally delayed claim under 35 U.S.C. § 120 for the benefit of a prior-filed non-provisional application.

The petition is **DISMISSED AS MOOT**.

A petition for acceptance of a claim for late priority under 37 CFR 1.78(a)(3) is only applicable to those applications filed on or after November 29, 2000.

Along with the instant petition under 37 CFR §§ 1.78(a)(3), petitioner has submitted an amendment to the first sentence of the specification following the title to include a reference to the prior-filed nonprovisional application.

The instant pending nonprovisional application was filed on March 1, 2004, and was pending at the time of the filing of the instant petition. While a reference to the prior-filed nonprovisional application was not included in an ADS or in the first sentence of the specification following the title, reference nevertheless was made in the transmittal letter and the declaration filed with the above identified application.

The current procedure where a claim for priority under 37 CFR §§ 1.78(a)(3) is not included in the first sentence of the specification or in an ADS but does appear either in the oath or declaration or a transmittal letter filed with the application and the Office notes the claim for priority, no petition will be required to accept a late claim for priority. This is because the application would have been scheduled for publication on the basis of the information concerning the claim submitted elsewhere in the application with the time period set forth in 37 CFR §§ 1.78(a)(2)(ii). However, on the other hand, if the USPTO does not note the claim for priority to the prior-filed application(s) set forth in the oath or declaration or transmittal letter submitted with the application, a petition will


be required to accept a late claim for priority under 37 CFR §§ 1.78(a)(3).<sup>1</sup> In the instant case, the Office noted the claim for priority of the prior-filed nonprovisional application in the transmittal letter filed with the application, as shown by its inclusion on the filing receipt.

It should be noted also that if the claim for priority had not been noted by the Office and a petition had been required, it would have been dismissed as the amendment filed failed to state the relationship of the continuing application to the instant application. 37 CFR 1.78(a)(2)(i) requires that any nonprovisional application claiming the benefit of one or more prior-filed copending nonprovisional applications must contain or be amended to contain a reference to each such prior-filed application, identifying it by application number (consisting of the series code and serial number) and indicating the relationship of the applications. The relationship between the applications is whether the subject application is a continuation, divisional, or continuation-in-part of a prior-filed nonprovisional application. An example of a proper benefit claim is: "This application is a continuation of Application No. 10/---, filed---." A benefit claim that merely states: "This application claims the benefit of Application No. 10/---, filed---," does not comply with 37 CFR 1.78(a)(2)(i) since the proper relationship, which includes the type of continuing application, is not stated. Also, the status of each nonprovisional parent application (if it is patented or abandoned) should also be indicated, following the filing date of the parent nonprovisional application. See MPEP Section 201.11, Reference to Prior Nonprovisional Applications.

In view of the above, the \$1370.00 petition fee submitted is unnecessary and will be refunded to petitioner's deposit account in due course.

Any questions concerning this decision on petition may be directed to Senior Petitions Attorney Patricia Faison-Ball at (571) 272-3212. All other inquiries concerning either the examination procedures or status of the application should be directed the Technology Center.

This matter is being referred to Technology Center Art Unit 2813 for appropriate processing of the amendment filed April 4, 2006.

  
Frances Hicks  
Petitions Examiner  
Office of Petitions

---

<sup>1</sup> Note MPEP 201.11 (V), page 200-75 (Rev. 1. Feb. 2004 and 66 Federal Register 67087 at 67089 (Dec. 28, 2001), effective December 28, 2001.